

(Michx.) Chapman. The last two taxa, *L. philadelphicum* and *L. catesbaei*, have erect flowers, long-unguiculate tepals, etc. and are not particularly closely related to the *L. canadense* group.

A key to the major taxa described above has been published by E. T. Wherry, A Key to the Eastern North American Lilies, *Bartonia* **24**: 5-8. 1947.

The present study is based primarily on the specimens preserved in the Herbarium of the Botany and Plant Pathology Division, Science Service, Department of Agriculture, Ottawa (DAO), supplemented by those preserved in the Herbarium of the National Museum of Canada, Ottawa (CAN).

---

## NUTTALL'S QUARREL WITH PURSH

JEANNETTE E. GRAUSTEIN

UNTIL 1936 there was no certainty about Thomas Nuttall's activities or location in 1812 and the years immediately following. Although we are now far better informed, little attention seems to be paid to the light which has been shed on this period. Thinking has not been brought into line with the facts that have been established.<sup>1</sup>

Of first importance in Nuttall's situation was his contract with Professor Benjamin Smith Barton, signed on April 7, 1810, before starting on his long expedition through the northwestern Territories. By the contract his journals and observations were the exclusive property of Barton who financed the journey; he was, however, permitted to retain a part of all the specimens which he collected but must not dispose of them without Barton's consent less "they might otherwise fall into the hands of persons who would use them to my disadvantage." "Should I ever publish the journal, I hereby promise and bind myself to make a public acknowledgement, that the journey was performed by you, and to give you full credit for what services you may have rendered to me."

When Nuttall arrived at New Orleans in December, 1811,

<sup>1</sup> F. W. PENNELL, Travels and Scientific Collections of Thomas Nuttall," *Bartonia* **18** (1936), 1-51.

Jeannette E. Graustein, "Nuttall's Travels into the Old Northwest," *Chronica Botanica* **14** (1950/51), 1-88.

on his return from the upper Missouri, he found the COLUMBIA about ready to sail for Liverpool, the familiar ground of his apprenticeship and his home port which he had left almost four years before. Added to the natural desire of a young man (approaching his twenty-sixth birthday) to visit his family after so long a separation, was the serious threat of war between the United States and England which might postpone such a visit indefinitely. Before embarking for Liverpool he sent to Barton his share of dried plants and seeds with memoranda. There is evidence that in the notes he indicated his intention of naming the most flamboyant plant of his collection (which he believed belonged in an undescribed genus) in honor of Barton.

When Nuttall reached England early in 1812 he had no intention of publishing anything but *Bartonia*; not only was he legally restrained but he knew that to his patron any further publication would be an unforgivable sin. In 1810 Barton described Nuttall as distinguished by "innocence of character," and that was his reputation with the Astorians. He was so lacking in guile that his one treasured genus was snatched from him by the unscrupulous Pursh. That his quarrel with Pursh was strictly limited to the theft of the genus *Bartonia* has not been widely understood.

Nuttall met Pursh in London—doubtless at the Banksian Herbarium—and, since Barton had been the patron of both, eagerly showed him a specimen of the proposed *Bartonia* and the notes concerning it which he was planning to publish. Shortly thereafter, in August 1812, *Bartonia decapetala* appeared in the *Botanical Magazine* under Pursh's name although the accompanying colored plate was done from Nuttall's specimen. This was the grievance Nuttall held against Pursh—that he filched from him the only plant that he was free to publish from among the abundant and interesting specimens collected during two arduous and hazardous years. It was a cruel disappointment: it would have been Nuttall's first publication of any kind; it might have modified the disapproval of his somewhat estranged uncle whose support could facilitate his chosen work; it deprived him of the small unit of recognition in the botanical world for which he had hoped, leaving him with experience as his harvest from two years of labor.

Nuttall evidently drew a line between scientific botany and floriculture and between scientific collections and horticultural so far as his contract was concerned for he sold to Fraser seeds and living plants which he had laboriously transferred to England. He needed any funds they might bring. There is no doubt that he drew up the Fraser Catalogue.<sup>2</sup> It is equally certain that he did not consider it a valid publication of the species involved. That he intended to stand by his contract with Barton is indicated by the fact that he made no attempt to publish any of his new species in the *Botanical Magazine*—a device by which he could have anticipated a few items at least of Pursh's *Flora*—and remained aloof while others became authors of his plants in that publication.

When Pursh's *Flora Americae Septentrionalis* appeared in mid-December 1813, Nuttall was disturbed by the treatment of many of the species, especially the new plants of the West. He found the descriptions scant, habitats lacking, range erroneous, and in some cases he disagreed with the classifications. These deficiencies were to an appreciable extent the result of Pursh's limited field knowledge for he had not been south of Virginia nor west of the Appalachians. It became Nuttall's aim to write a new edition of Pursh's *Flora* in order to correct the errors. Although Shinnars calls him "secretive" he announced this intention to William Baldwin in the autumn of 1815 not long after his return from England, and there can be no doubt that he told Zaccheus Collins and other friends of his plans. The outcome of this urgent wish was *Genera of North American Plants and a Catalogue of the Species to the Year 1817*, a work which grew from concern over the inadequacies of Pursh's *Flora* and which naturally, therefore, comments freely on Pursh's errors. This perhaps is the basis for Shinnars' opinion that Nuttall "was resentful of Pursh's having anticipated him in publishing." Since Nuttall had known from the first that he could not publish the plants collected under Barton's aegis he had nothing personally at stake in the matter.—501 W. 113, NEW YORK CITY.

<sup>2</sup> No convincing evidence to the contrary has been furnished by Lloyd H. Shinnars in questioning Nuttall's authorship in "Non-Validity of Nuttallian Names in Fraser's Catalogue." *RHODORA* 57: 290-293, 1955.